UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,715	01/17/2002	Yasuyuki Anami	04739.0074	4891

22852   7590   02/09/2009
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
PROCTOR, JASON SCOTT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-21 were rejected in the Office Action entered on 16 July 2008.

Applicants' submission on 16 October 2008 has amended claims 1-11, 14, 15, 19, and 20.

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-21 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The Examiner thanks Applicants for clarifying that the 9 February 2005 IDS statement

consisted of only one page of cited references.

Claim Objections

2.   The previous objection to claims 8, 9, 11, 15, and 20 is withdrawn in response to the

amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The previous rejections of claims 4, 6, 7, 8, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite, are withdrawn in response to the amendment to the claims.

Response to Arguments – 35 USC § 102

4.   In response to the previous rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Sebastian, Applicants argue primarily that:

> The Office Action cited a "template scheme" of Sebastian as an alleged disclosure of the claimed
> "database." Office Action, p.6. Applicant submits that Sebastian does not disclose, however, that the
> template scheme "divides a history of design work for creating a shape model for each part of the shape

model and holds a plurality of design work histories as unit work history data," as recited in claim 1.
Therefore, Sebastian does not disclose "a database which divides a history of design work for creating a
shape model for each part of the shape model and holds a plurality of design work histories as unit work
history data," as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner respectfully traverses this argument as follows.

Sebastian discloses a database which divides a history of design work for creating a shape

model for each part of the shape model and holds a plurality of design work history as unit work

history data [*"For example, an 'attach::gusset-reinforce_boss' structure can be defined by*

*reference to an existing boss template and an existing gusset template **without the need to re-***

***specify the underlying data structures.** In turn, a 'mount::corner_boss' construct could be*

defined as four 'attach::boss' templates, located at the corners of a planar quadrilateral. These

compound templates are called macro-feature templates - they are created by inclusion of the

*defining elements or data structures of **previously defined features.**"* (column 11, line 60 -

column 12, line 2, emphasis added)]. That is, each of the stored templates and macro-feature

templates is an example of a stored "history of design work". Thus Sebastian teaches a stored

library of templates and macros which collectively represent "a division of a history of design

work for creating a shape model for each part of the shape model." The individual templates are

"unit work history data", which may be combined to form "macro-feature templates".

5.   Applicants further argue that:

The "feature template" disclosed in Sebastian is designed to provide a uniform data handling mechanism
that spans the domain of part, tooling, process and material. *See* Sebastian, col. 11, lines 32-33. Applicant
submits that Sebastian's "feature template" is not related to the "unit work history data" recited in claim 1.
Moreover, Sebastian does not disclose a control section configured to "fetch at least two unit work history
data … and combine the at least two selected unit work history data …," as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner respectfully traverses this argument as follows.

In addition to the benefits noted by Applicants, Sebastian discloses that the "feature templates" allows for previous design work to be reused, saving time and effort (Sebastian, column 11, line 60 – column 12, line 2). Sebastian discloses "fetch[ing] at least two unit work history data [*i.e. "feature templates"*] and combin[ing] the at least two selected unit work history data" [*"For example, an 'attach::gusset-reinforce_boss' structure can be defined by reference to an existing boss template and an existing gusset template without the need to re-specify the underlying data structures.* **In turn, a 'mount::corner_boss' construct could be defined as four 'attach::boss' templates, located at the corners of a planar quadrilateral. These compound templates are called macro-feature templates - they are created by inclusion of the defining elements or data structures of previously defined features."** (column 11, line 60 - column 12, line 2, emphasis added)].

Additionally, Sebastian discloses a user interacting with the disclosed system (column 22, lines 21-65) that exemplifies the stored "feature templates" guiding the future design work.

Applicants submit similar arguments for claims 2, 7, 9, 11; 3-6, 8, and 10 which are traversed as shown above.

6.   Applicants further argue that:

> Sebastian does not disclose "a series of design work histories is held in multiple quantities as work history data in a database ..., at least two selected work history data are fetched from the held multiple work history data ..., and design work data for creating a one-piece shape model by combining the at least two fetched work history data and connecting part shape models corresponding to the respective work history data is output," as recited in claim 12. Applicant submits that Sebastian fails to disclose each and every feature of each of the claims 12-15. Therefore, independent claims 12-15 are allowable over Sebastian. Claim 16 depends from claim 15, and thus is allowable at least because of its dependence from claim 15.

The Examiner respectfully traverses this argument as follows.

Sebastian discloses holding "multiple quantities" of design work histories [*i.e.* storing

"feature templates"], fetching and combining at least two work history data [for example,

"mount::corner_boss" (column 11, line 60 – column 12, line 2)], and outputting the fetched work

history data and connecting part shape models [*"A tapered wall and a rib can be regarded as*

sub-parts that can be used to make a part" (column 12, lines 3-10); *"the present invention ...*

uses Pro-Engineer from Parametric Technology Inc. as its solid modeling and front-end CAD

system." (column 11, lines 21-27)].

7.   Applicants further argue that:

> Claims 17-20 each recite a recording medium storing a design support program and being computer-
> readable, wherein the design support program comprises one or more modules configured to deal with
> "design work histories," "histories of design work," and/or "work history data," which are not disclosed in
> Sebastian. Applicant submits that Sebastian fails to disclose each and every feature of each of claims 17-
> 20. Therefore, claims 17-20 are allowable over Sebastian. Claim 21 is also allowable at least because of
> its dependence from claim 20.

The Examiner respectfully traverses these arguments as shown above.

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but have been found unpersuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No.

5,552,995 to Sebastian.

Regarding claim 1, Sebastian discloses:

A design support system [(abstract); *"...the present invention is implemented in the*

'C++' programming language and uses Pro-Engineer from Parametric Technology Inc. as its

solid modeling and front-end CAD system." (column 11, lines 21-26); *"The present invention*

enables a designer to create feature templates and store them in a feature template library."

(column 13, lines 44-46)], comprising:

database (FIG. 2, reference 34) which divides a history of design work for creating a

shape model for each part of the shape model and holds a plurality of design work histories as

unit work history data [*"The template scheme provides a uniform data handling mechanism that*

spans the domain of part, tooling, process and material. The templates of the present invention

allow the collection, under a single header, of various types of information: fixed parameters

(e.g., user supplied data), parameters derived by relationship with other parameters from the

same template (e.g., a boss' outer diameter computed from the value of its own inner diameter),

parameters derived by relationship with parameters from other templates in the same domain

(e.g., a boss' height computed from the thickness of the wall to which it is attached), and

parameters derived by relationship with parameters from other templates in other domains (e.g.,

a boss' draft angle computed from the tool orientation relative to the boss)." (column 11, lines

32-49)]; and

a control section configured to fetch at least two unit work history data selected from the

plurality of unit work history data held by the database [*"An example of a feature template is a*

"support::tapered wall" feature template, wherein the primitive object is a tapered wall and the function of the tapered wall is support. Another example is a "support::rib" feature template that represents a type of projection known as a rib, where the rib has a support function. A tapered wall and a rib can be regarded as sub-parts that can be used to make a part." (column 12, lines 3-11)]; and

combine at least two selected unit work history data and output design work data for creating a combined shape model which is formed by joining part shape models corresponding to the respective unit work history data (column 12, lines 3-11; column 11, line 60 – column 12, line 2).

Regarding claim 2, Sebastian discloses:

A design support system which outputs work data for creating a shape model of a design target in order to create the shape model of the design target conforming to a standard shape [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49)], comprising:

A database which holds a plurality of unit work history data which are obtained by dividing a history of a design work performed with reference to a first standard shape for each design work history corresponding to a shape model of a predetermined portion (column 11, lines 32-49);

A control section configured to receive designation of data about a second standard shape (FIG. 2, reference 35);

Fetch multiple unit work history data selected from the multiple unit work history data held by the database (column 12, lines 3-11); and

combine each of the fetched unit work history data, reproduce design work with reference to the designated second standard shape for the design works performed with reference to the first standard shape among the design works contained in the unit work history data, and output work data corresponding to a combined shape model conforming to the second standard shape [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)].

Regarding claim 3, Sebastian discloses:

The design support system according to claim 2 wherein the control section is further configured to compute at least one technical characteristic value of a combined shape model which is created from the output work data [*"As shown in FIG. 2A, the part-feature template includes a volume formula. To evaluate this formula, the template accesses all the sub-part templates to determine the volume of the sub-parts, and then sums these volumes. To evaluate the material cost formula, the template accesses the material-feature template 206 to obtain material price information."* (column 12, lines 57-67)].

Regarding claim 4, Sebastian discloses:

The design support system according to claim 3, wherein:

The database accumulates technical conditions, which are to be met by a part shape model to be created according to each unit work history data, in association with each unit work history data; and wherein the control section is further configured to:

Compare the computed technical characteristic value with the technical conditions related to unit work history data which is the origin of the work data [*"The material selector module 72*

generates an a priori choice of suitable material(s) for the product based upon product application and environment. The material selector module 72 draws upon a material properties database 90 for values and a product design library for the subset of critical properties and their default values based upon application and environment. The material selector module 72 interacts with the core design module 76 to continually scan and update a list of viable materials based upon updated data on part performance requirements. [...] The engineering economics estimator module 74 allows the designer to examine the overall part cost sensitivity to factors that include: material, part dimensions, tool fabrication cost, production lot size, processing cost etc. The engineering economics estimator module can be utilized both before and after part/tool geometry definition. During part creation, the engineering economics estimator module 74 can provide feedback of the total part cost, and the contributions to this cost due to material, tooling, and processing." (column 16, lines 19-47)].

Regarding claim 5, Sebastian discloses:

The design support system according to claim 2, wherein the control section is further configured to receive designation of data about a third standard shape (FIG. 2, reference 35); wherein:

The work data is converted by reproducing a design work with reference to the designated third standard shape for work included in the work contained in the output work data and performed with reference to the second standard shape, and converted work data corresponding to a shape model conforming to the third standard shape is output [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)].

Regarding claim 6, Sebastian discloses:

The design support system according to claim 1, wherein the control section is further configured to analyze the history of design work and extract input work carried out by a person in charge of work when unit historical data is created [*"CreateT... creates a new template..."* (column 21, lines 50-55, etc.)]; and the design support system further including:

A display section which shows the extracted input work to the person in charge of work to request input of design support information [*"In this example, the system searches for a function template using "Fasten" as the search criteria and provides the user with the boss feature."* (column 22, lines 21-28); *"At any time the user has the ability to modify the feature attribute values and the system processes the effect of these changes..."* (column 22, lines 57-65)]; and

A database which records the design support information in a history of the design work and divides the history of the design work into unit historical data when the design support information is input so to show when the design support information is reused (column 22, lines 41-65).

Regarding claim 7, Sebastian discloses:

A design support system which holds a series of design work histories to reuse as work history data and creates a shape based on the work history data [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)], comprising:

A control section which analyzes the work history data to extract input work carried out by a person in charge of work (column 21, lines 50-55, etc.);

A display section which shows the extracted input work to the person in charge of work to request input of design support information (column 22, lines 21-65); and

A database which records the design support information in the work history data when the design support information is input so to show when the design support information is reused (column 22, lines 41-65).

Regarding claim 8, Sebastian discloses:

The design support system according to claim 7, wherein the database is further configured to generate unit work history data by dividing the work history data into predetermined work units for a design target (column 21, lines 50-55, etc.).

Regarding claim 9, Sebastian discloses:

A design support system (abstract), comprising:

A database which accumulates unit work history data which is formed by dividing a history of past design work into work units determined for a design target and contains design support information related to input work among the design work [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)];

A control section configured to selectively show the unit work history on a display section upon receiving designation of the design target [(column 22, lines 21-65) alternatively (column 16, lines 19-47)];

Create a shape by sequentially reproducing the selected unit work history [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)]; and

Provide design support information related to input work when the input work is demanded while the unit work history is being reproduced [(column 22, lines 21-65) alternatively (column 16, lines 19-47)].

Regarding claim 10, Sebastian discloses:

The design support system according to claim 9, wherein the control section is further configured to judge whether the work history to be reproduced agrees with predetermined guidance display conditions while the unit work history is being reproduced (column 22, lines 21-65); and wherein

The display section is further configured to implement a guidance display determined in connection with the guide display conditions if the work history agrees with the guidance display conditions (column 22, lines 21-65).

Regarding claim 11, Sebastian discloses:

A database which accumulates unit work history data which is formed by dividing a history of past design work into work units determined for a design target and contains design support information related to an input work among the design work [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)];

A first display device which shows a shape of the design target obtained by sequentially reproducing a history of the design work with reference to the unit work history data [*"The*

representative embodiment supports, amongst others, the following interfaces: to CAD systems –

IGES, Pro-Engineer and IDEAS; for FEM structural analysis – PATRAN/NASTRAN and IDEAS;

for FEM molding filling, cooling and shrinkage analysis – C-FLOW, IDEAS, Moldflow and

TMC; and for tool design – IDEAS, Pro-Engineer and DME Moldbase Catalog." (column 18,

lines 35-41)]; and

A second display device which shows design support information contained in the unit

work history data by reproducing a history of the design work prior to the reproduction at the

first display device [(column 18, lines 35-41); (column 11, lines 21-26)].

Regarding claim 12, Sebastian discloses:

A design support method using a computer, wherein:

A series of design work histories is held in multiple quantities as work history data in a

database in order to create a part shape model [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12,

lines 3-11); (column 13, lines 44-46)];

At least two selected history data are fetched from the held multiple work history data

according to an instruction input to a processor (column 22, lines 21-65); and

Design work data for creating a one-piece shape model by combining the at least two

fetched work history data and connecting part shape models corresponding to the respective

work history data is output (column 12, lines 3-11).

Regarding claim 13, Sebastian discloses:

A design support method which uses a computer to create a shape model of a design target conforming to a desired standard shape according to input to its processor and outputs work data for creating the shape model of the design target [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11); (column 13, lines 44-46)], comprising the steps of:

Holding a plurality of histories of design work performed in the past with reference to the respective standard shapes in a database as work history data (column 13, lines 44-46);

Accepting designation of data about a second standard shape, which is a desired standard shape, according to an instruction input to the processor (column 22, lines 21-65);

Fetching the selected multiple work history data from the multiple work history data held in the database (column 22, lines 21-65); and

Combining respective pieces of the fetched work history data, reproducing design work with reference to the designated second standard shape for the design work performed in the past with reference to the respective standard shapes among the design work contained in the work history data, and outputting work data corresponding to a combined shape model conforming to the second standard shape (column 12, lines 3-11).

Regarding claim 14, Sebastian discloses:

A design support method which holds a series of design work histories as work history data in order for reuse and generates a shape by a computer according to the work history data according to an instruction input to a processor [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11); (column 13, lines 44-46)], comprising the steps of:

Analyzing the work history data upon input to the processor to extract the input work

performed by a person in charge of work (column 22, lines 21-65);

Showing the extracted input work to the person in charge of work to request input of

design support information; and

when the design support information is input, recording the design support information in

the work history data [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 22, lines 21-65)].

Regarding claim 15, Sebastian discloses:

A design support method, comprising the steps of:

Accumulating, using a computer, unit work history data which is formed by dividing a

history of past design work into work units determined for a design target and contains design

support information related to input work among the design work;

Showing the unit work history selectively upon receiving designation of the design target

by the computer;

Creating a shape by sequentially reproducing the selected unit work history; and

Providing the design support information related to input work when the input work is

demanded while the unit work history is being reproduced [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49);

(column 12, lines 3-11); (column 13, lines 44-46); (column 22, lines 21-65). This claim presents

a combination of limitations recited by previous claims. These citations of the prior art are

explained in more detail in the context of the previous claims.].

Regarding claim 16, Sebastian discloses wherein it is judged whether the work history to be reproduced conforms to predetermined guidance display conditions while the unit work history data is being reproduced by the computer and, if it conforms to the guidance display conditions, a guidance display determined in connection with the guide display conditions is performed (column 22, lines 21-65).

Regarding claim 17, Sebastian discloses a recording medium storing a design support program and being computer-readable, the design support program comprising:

A module holding a series of design work histories as a plurality of work history data for creation of a part shape model [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11); (column 13, lines 44-46)];

A module fetching at least two selected work history data from the held multiple work history data (column 22, lines 21-65); and

A module for outputting design work data for creating a one-piece shape model by combining the at least two fetched work history data and connecting part shape models corresponding to the respective work history data (column 12, lines 3-11).

Regarding claim 18, Sebastian discloses:

A recording medium storing a design support program and being computer-readable, the design support program comprising:

A module outputting work data for creating a shape model of a design target in order to create the shape model of the design target conforming to a desired standard shape [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)];

A module holding a history of design work performed with reference to a first standard shape as a plurality of work history data [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)];

A module receiving designation of data about a second standard shape which is a desired standard shape [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)];

A module fetching the selected multiple work history data from the held multiple work history data (column 22, lines 21-65); and

A module combining each of the fetched work history data, reproducing design work with reference to the designated second standard shape for the design works performed with reference to the first standard shape among the design works contained in the work history data, and outputting work data corresponding to a one-piece shape model conforming to the second standard shape [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11); (column 13, lines 44-46); (column 22, lines 21-65). This claim presents a combination of limitations recited by previous claims. These citations of the prior art are explained in more detail in the context of the previous claims.].

Regarding claim 19, Sebastian discloses:

A recording medium storing a design support program and being computer-readable, the design support program comprising:

A module holding a series of design work histories to reuse as a work history data (column 13, lines 44-46);

A module analyzing the work history data to extract input work performed by a person in charge of work (column 22, lines 21-65);

A module showing the extracted input work to the person in charge of work to receive input of design support information (column 22, lines 21-65); and

A module recording the design support information in the work history data when the design support information is input (column 22, lines 21-65).

Regarding claim 20, Sebastian discloses:

A recording medium storing a design support program and being computer-readable, the design support program comprising:

A module accumulating unit work history data which is formed by dividing a history of past design work into work units determined for a design target and contains design support information related to input work among the design work [(abstract); (column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11); (column 13, lines 44-46)];

A module selectively showing the unit work history upon receiving designation of the design target (column 22, lines 21-65);

A module creating a shape by sequentially reproducing the selected unit work history [(column 11, lines 32-49); (column 12, lines 3-11)]; and

A module providing design support information related to an input work when the input work is demanded while the unit work history is being reproduced (column 16, lines 19-47).

Regarding claim 21, Sebastian discloses:

The recording medium being computer-readable according to claim 20, wherein:

The design support program stored in the recording medium further includes a module judging whether the work history to be reproduced agrees with predetermined guidance display conditions while the unit work history is being reproduced and, if the work history agrees with the guidance display conditions, implements a guidance display determined in connection with the conditions [(column 16, lines 19-47); (column 22, lines 21-65)].

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.   Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.   See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Proctor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3713. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-4:30 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Rodriguez can be reached at (571) 272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Proctor
Examiner
Art Unit 2123

jsp

/Paul L Rodriguez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123